

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are pending and stand rejected. All pending claims are believed to be allowable over the references cited by the Examiner as discussed below. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance for the present application is respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1-12 and 14-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Drake.

With respect to Drake, the Examiner reads the roller 82 (as shown in Figs. 3, 6, and 7) as the rear catch mechanism and bottom wall of 72 underneath slot 76 as the pivot support. The drawer unit 30 may be assembled onto the removed from the track assemblies 70, 80 by rollers 82. Specifically, the rollers 82 may enter the housing track assembly 70 through the slots 76 (col. 5, lines 12-14). The Examiner notes that the drawer or shelf unit 30 is pivotable about the pivot.

In particular, Drake's keyboard drawer 30 moves on track assemblies 70, 80 by rollers 82 and unit track assemblies 84. The rollers 82 enter the housing track assembly 70 through a slot 76 provided in the track assembly 70. The unit rollers 82 slide along the housing track assembly 70. The round stop member 75 allows easy removal of the drawer unit 30 from the housing track assembly 70.

However, independent claims 1 and 14 generally recite that when the front shelf end of the slidable shelf is lowered relative to the rear shelf end of the slidable shelf, the guides substantially support the slidable shelf via the pivot of the rear catch mechanism.

In contrast, when Drake's pivot support (bottom wall of 72 underneath slot 76 as shown in FIG. 6) engages the pivot of the rear catch mechanism 82, a user may manually lift up the drawer unit 30 such that the front end is *raised* relative to the rear end.

The Examiner states on page 3, lines 2-4 of the Office Action that "the front end of the shelf of Drake et al teaches structure as claimed as a structure is entitled to all its uses and there is no structure to preclude movement of the front shelf end of lower relative to the rear end."

Applicant respectfully disagrees with such characterization of Drake. Rather, Drake's structure prevents the front end of the drawer 30 from being pivoted downward relative to its rear end. As shown in FIG. 6, for example, when the drawer is in the fully extended position, the round stop member 75 prevents the front of the drawer 30 from being pivoted downward. As

also shown in FIG. 6, for example, when the drawer is in any position other than the fully extended position, the top edge of the track assembly 70 would prevent the front of the drawer 30 from being pivoted downward. The drawer 30 is meant to support a keyboard and thus allowing it to pivot downward such as when a user is typing on the keyboard is certainly desirable.

When in the fully extended position, the drawer 30 may be pivoted up such that the roller 82 may enter the housing track assembly 70 through the slot 76. In other words, the only pivoting of the front end of the drawer 30 that is allowed by the structure disclosed by Drake is upward, not downward.

Furthermore, when the drawer unit 30 is pivoted up, the drawer unit 30 is not substantially supported by the guides via the pivot of the rear catch mechanism 82 (as generally recited in each of independent claims 1 and 14), but rather, by the user performing the lifting of the drawer unit.

Thus Drake does not disclose or suggest that the drawer unit be able to be lowered such that the front shelf end of the slidable shelf is lower relative to the rear shelf end nor that the drawer unit, when pivoted, be substantially supported by the guides via the pivot of the rear catch mechanism.

Withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 1 and 14 as well as claims 2-12 and 15-24 dependent variously therefrom under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 13 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Drake.

However, dependent claims 13 and 25 are believed to be allowable at least because the independent claims 1 and 14 from which they depend, respectively, are allowable as discussed above.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 13 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully request a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

In the unlikely event that the transmittal letter accompanying this document is separated from this document and the Patent Office determines that an Extension of Time under 37 CFR 1.136 and/or any other relief is required, Applicant hereby petitions for any required relief including Extensions of Time and/or any other relief and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. **50-1217** (Order No. **GOOGP011**).

Respectfully submitted,



Jung-hua Kuo
Reg. No. 41,918
P.O. Box 3275
Los Altos, CA 94024
Telephone: (650) 988-8070
Facsimile: (650) 988-8090